



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,718	02/13/2001	Steven P. Hamilton	15879-13	1023

7590 05/06/2005

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, L.L.P.
Attn: Sung I. Oh, Esq.
801 So. Figueroa St., 14th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5554

EXAMINER

LOWE, MICHAEL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3652

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/782,718

Applicant(s)

HAMILTON, STEVEN P.

Examiner

M. Scott Lowe

Art Unit

3652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 and 48-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,3,5-17 and 19-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 22-45,53,55 and 57 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,18,48-52 and 54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 54 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/3/05.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the toe truck bed must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 54 is objected to because of the following informalities: lines 6 and 7 state "the the". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 48-51, 54, 56, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman (US 3,912,139) in view of Hymer (US 5,462,398), Casey (US 4,696,484) and Neff (US 3,822,798).

Re claims 1, 4, 48, 49, 54, 56, Bowman teaches an apparatus 10 for transporting a cycle 130 comprising a first front chock 16, 18 adapted to associate with the front side of a first wheel 132 of a cycle.

Bowman teaches the rear sidewalls acting as rear chocks (column 4, lines 36-37) but does not teach a first rear chock adapted to associate with the back side of a second wheel of the cycle. Hymer teaches using rear-hinged ramp 150 as a rear chock adapted to associate with the backside of a second wheel of a cycle in order to keep the cycle from moving.

Bowman does not teach a dolly adapted to couple to a first end of each of the cradle bars extending from the first front chock, said dolly having an actuator and a pair of arms, each of said arms having a pivotal end and a free end, said pivotal end of each

Art Unit: 3652

of said arms pivotally coupled to the actuator. Casey teaches a dolly adapted to couple to a first end of each of cradle bars 24,26 extending from the first front chock, said dolly having an actuator 82 and a pair of arms, each of said arms having a pivotal end and a free end, said pivotal end of each of said arms pivotally coupled to the actuator.

Neff teaches the desirability of having a cycle transport with dollies in order to move the transport in dependent of the tow vehicle to a storage place (column 3, lines 50-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bowman by collective general teachings of Hymer and Casey to use rear-hinged ramp 20 as a rear chock adapted to associate with the backside of a second wheel of a cycle in order to keep the cycle from moving and a dolly adapted to couple to a first end of each of cradle bars extending from the first front chock, said dolly having an actuator and a pair of arms, each of said arms having a pivotal end and a free end, said pivotal end of each of said arms pivotally coupled to the actuator in order to be able roll a cycle on or off of a towing vehicle to a storage place.

As just modified Bowman teaches a pair of cradle bars 12a,12b,14a,14b releasably coupled to the first front 16, 18 and rear chocks 20 wherein the first and second wheels are positioned between the pair a cradle bars.

Re claim 50, Bowman teaches a second front chock 16 adapted to associate with a backside of the first wheel.

Re claim 51, Bowman does not teach a second rear chock adapted to associate with a front side of the second wheel. Casey teaches (figures, column 2, lines 36-62)

Art Unit: 3652

providing chocks to both the front and rear sides of wheels in order to cradle the wheels and limit wheel movement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bowman by the general teaching of Casey to have chocks to both the front and rear sides of wheels in order to cradle the wheels and limit wheel movement.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman (US 3,912,139) in view of Hymer (US 5,462,398), Casey (US 4,696,484) and Neff (US 3,822,798) as modified in claim 1 and further modified in view of Scott (US 5,234,307).

Re claim 18, Bowman as already modified by Casey teaches the dolly used to raise the first wheel or the second wheel of the motorcycle to roll the motorcycle. There is no mention of whether it is rolled onto to a bed of a tow truck. Scott provides a teaching of a cycle transport rolled onto the bed of a tow truck in order to transport the cycle and its transport. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bowman by the general teaching of Scott to have the cycle transport rolled onto the bed of a tow truck in order to transport the cycle and its transport.

Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman (US 3,912,139) in view of Hymer (US 5,462,398), Casey (US 4,696,484), Neff (US 3,822,798) and Scott (US 5,234,307).

Art Unit: 3652

Re claim 52, Bowman teaches an apparatus 10 for transporting a cycle 130 comprising a first front chock 16,18 adapted to associate with the front side of a first wheel 132 of a cycle.

Bowman teaches the rear sidewalls acting as rear chocks (column 4, lines 36-37) but does not teach a first rear chock adapted to associate with the back side of a second wheel of the cycle. Hymer teaches using rear-hinged ramp 150 as a rear chock adapted to associate with the backside of a second wheel of a cycle in order to keep the cycle from moving.

Bowman does not teach a dolly adapted to couple to a first end of each of the cradle bars extending from the first front chock, said dolly having an actuator and a pair of arms, each of said arms having a pivotal end and a free end, said pivotal end of each of said arms pivotally coupled to the actuator. Casey teaches a dolly adapted to couple to a first end of each of cradle bars 24,26 extending from the first front chock, said dolly having an actuator 82 and a pair of arms, each of said arms having a pivotal end and a free end, said pivotal end of each of said arms pivotally coupled to the actuator.

Neff teaches the desirability of having a cycle transport with dollies in order to move the transport independent of the tow vehicle to a storage place (column 3, lines 50-52).

Scott provides a teaching of a cycle transport rolled onto the bed of a tow truck in order to transport the cycle and its transport.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bowman by collective general teachings of

Art Unit: 3652

Hymer, Casey and Scott to use rear-hinged ramp 20 as a rear chock adapted to associate with the backside of a second wheel of a cycle in order to keep the cycle from moving and a dolly adapted to couple to a first end of each of cradle bars extending from the first front chock, said dolly having an actuator and a pair of arms, each of said arms having a pivotal end and a free end, said pivotal end of each of said arms pivotally coupled to the actuator in order to be able roll a cycle on or off of a towing vehicle to a storage place and to have the cycle transport rolled onto the bed of a tow truck in order to transport the cycle and its transport.

As just modified Bowman teaches a pair of cradle bars 12a,12b,14a,14b releasably coupled to the first front 16, 18 and rear chocks 20 wherein the first and second wheels are positioned between the pair a cradle bars.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 22-45,53,55,57 are allowed. Claim 22 is generic and allowable.

Accordingly, the restriction requirement as to the encompassed species is hereby withdrawn and claims 23-44,53 are no longer withdrawn from consideration since all of the claims to this species depend from or otherwise include each of the limitations of an allowed generic claim. In view of the above noted withdrawal of the restriction requirement as to the linked species, applicant(s) are advised that if any claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable generic linking claim(s) be presented in a continuation or divisional application, such claims may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of

the instant application. Once a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. See *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Re claims 22,55, the prior art taken as a whole does not show nor suggest the first front chock and the first rear chock releasably coupled to both the first and second cradle bars with accompanying stated structure. The closest prior art, Bowman, does not include the first front chock and the first rear chock releasably coupled to both the first and second cradle bars with accompanying stated structure as required by the claim and there is no motivation absent the applicant's own disclosure, to modify the Bowman reference in the manner required by the claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's arguments filed 2/4/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., page 12 of the current amendment: "the pair of... are separate elements so that the apparatus... may assembled around a cycle even if the cycle is immobile...") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argued that U-shaped member is a one piece member and thus Bowman does not teach "a pair of cradle bars" that are two separate elements. In response it is noted that the "two separate elements" limitation is not claimed and item 12 is clearly shown in figure 3 as more than a single piece.

Applicant argued on page 13 of the current amendment that Casey would not meet the claims because the dollies would allegedly not be on the front and back of the wheels. However, Bowman is being modified by Casey and not the other way around. It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill to have equated the sides of 12 in Bowman with items 24,26 of Casey and modified accordingly, which results in the dollies being at the front and back of the wheels.

Since the previously claims are still rejected, the corresponding withdrawn claims remain withdrawn.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3652


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Scott Lowe whose telephone number is (571) 272-6929. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-4:30pm M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen Lillis can be reached on (571) 272-6607. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

msl


EILEEN D. LILLIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600